DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 454 UD 028 825

AUTHOR Herrington, Carolyn D.; And Others
TITLE Fiscal Deregulation, Urban Schools, and Chapter One: The Case of School-Wide Projects.
PUB DATE Mar 92
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Finance Association (New Orleans, LA, March 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; Inner City; Program Administration; School Districts; Social Problems; Urban Schools; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Deregulation; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Hawkins Stafford Act 1988; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This paper examines traditional regulatory concerns of urban educators in administering Chapter 1 programs, tracks the impact of a recent deregulatory provision (school-wide projects) enacted in 1988 and other amendments to Chapter 1 legislation, and discusses the reform's effectiveness given the increasingly severe problems facing many urban children. The experiences of 4 large urban school districts in Atlanta (Georgia), Chicago (Illinois), Dade County (Florida), and Dallas (Texas) in implementing 60 school-wide projects in 1989-90 reflect the diversity of large urban school systems. The 1988 school-wide project reform has had a modest impact. In Chicago, Atlanta, and Dallas, it has not been vigorously pursued. The reform has had the least impact in Chicago, whose system is reeling from massive, state-legislated restructuring that overwhelms district personnel and overshadows other initiatives. In Dade County, the reform has been implemented enthusiastically (with 48 school-wide projects in 1989-90), but only incremental improvements in academic achievement are predicted. The reform may not address the critical educational and social problems facing large urban school districts today. Recasting Chapter 1 schools as full-service schools would allow program resources and strategies to become part of a comprehensive strategy addressing poor inner-city children's needs. Included are 18 references and 1 table. (RLC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348454

FISCAL DEREGULATION, URBAN SCHOOLS, AND CHAPTER ONE: THE CASE OF SCHOOL-WIDE PROJECTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Carolyn D. Herrington
Associate Professor
Center for Needs Assessment and Planning
Learning Systems Institute
Florida State University

Martin E. Orland
Interim Executive Director
National Education Goals Panel
Washington, DC

Brenedette Hardy-Blake
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education
Florida State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Herrington
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

March, 1992

New Orleans, LA

A paper presented at the 1992 American Education Finance Association conference.

ED 028 525

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FISCAL DEREGULATION, URBAN SCHOOLS AND CHAPTER ONE:

The Case of School-Wide Projects

by

CAROLYN D. HERRINGTON, MARTIN E. ORLAND* AND BRENEDETTE HARDY-BLAKE

The last two decades have witnessed increasing stress on urban areas and the children that live there. Structural changes in the economic base of many urban communities have resulted in declines in employment opportunities, depressed wages and high poverty rates. The accompanying collapse of social and cultural networks within inner-city communities has resulted in extreme isolation and concentration of poor, minority residents. Characteristics of these communities include concentrations of female-headed households, high drop-out rates, families on welfare and working-age men who do not regularly work (Wilson, 1989). While patterns vary considerably across different cities and within communities in the cities, there is evidence that the stresses on cities in general have been increasing (James 1990) and that the concentration of stress in certain neighborhoods has been accelerating since the 1970s (Wilson 1989).

Children have not been spared. Poverty rates for children are higher in urban areas than in suburban or rural areas. In 1985-86, the child poverty rate for urban areas was 23.4, while the suburban rate was 12.8 and the rural rate, 22.8 (Child Trends, Inc. 1988). The concentration of poverty is also higher in urban areas, particularly for very young children. In 1987, 61% of poor children under six lived in areas of concentrated poverty (defined as an area in which at least 20% of the population is poor), compared to 21% in suburban areas and 51% in rural areas. Furthermore, the percentage of such children is increasing rapidly in urban areas. The percentage of poor children living in

---

*The views expressed by M. E. Orland are his own. No endorsement by the National Education Goals Panel should be inferred.

areas of concentrated poverty increased from 54% to 61% between 1975 and 1987 (while also increasing in suburban areas, the rate has actually decreased in rural areas) (National Center for Child Poverty 1990).

Chapter One is the primary federal school-based strategy serving low-income urban children. It is the close cousin of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a cornerstone of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. For 25 years the program has been providing assistance to school districts for the purpose of delivering supplementary educational services to low achieving students residing in areas with relatively high poverty concentrations. Nearly every school district in the country receives some support under this program.[1] Urban school systems, however, receive disproportionately large subsidies, since the funding formula is based heavily on local poverty rates. In 1984-85, urban school districts constituted 26 percent of all students in the nation but received 37 percent of all Chapter One funds (Birman et al., 1987).[2]

The purpose of this paper is (1) to examine the traditional regulatory concerns of urban education constituencies in the administration of Chapter One (2) to track the impact of a recent deregulatory provision, referred to as School-Wide Projects, enacted in 1988 along with other amendments to Chapter One and (3) to discuss the effectiveness of this strategy given the increasingly severe problems facing may children in urban areas.

Chapter One

Districts receiving Chapter One funds are required to target the assistance to schools with the highest concentrations of poverty. These schools in turn must then select for service students who are the lowest achievers (regardless of their individual family income), in the content area (i.e., reading, math, language, arts etc.) designated for program support. School districts almost always provide Chapter One services to

schools at the elementary grade level. Services at higher grade levels while less frequent, are not uncommon. Programs typically consist of remediation in reading and math delivered to small groups of students (3-8) on a daily basis for 30-50 minutes per day (Birman et al., 1987).

Chapter One is administered through state education agencies (SEAs) who are responsible for ensuring local compliance with all Chapter One rules and regulations. SEAs review annual Chapter One applications and make site visits to monitor particular features of the program. They also provide technical assistance to local districts in how to achieve regulatory compliance as well as how they might improve the quality of local programs. Regulations are both numerous and complex providing standards for resource allocation (e.g., selecting schools and students), determining the content of programs (e.g., conducting needs assessments, ensuring parent involvement) and program evaluation. Districts are also subject to program audit reviews (at both the federal and state levels) that could lead to fund paybacks should compliance violations be cited and sustained. Historically, large districts have been particular targets of federal compliance audits.

Urban Concerns: Program Funding and Program Regulation

Given Chapter One's focus on the economically and educationally disadvantaged, it should come as no surprise that urban interests have always represented a key national constituency for this program.[3] They were a critical force in the program's initial legislation (Bailey and Mosher 1968) and have demonstrated a sustaining interest in both supporting the program's continuation and in desiring changes in aspects of the program's funding formula and legal and regulatory framework. What changes have urban districts wanted in this program? To what extent has their agenda been realized?

Despite some small victories, urban interests have generally had limited success in altering either the level or distribution of funds to better meet their constituent's

needs. Perhaps their greatest failure has been their inability to raise overall funding levels for the program. Chapter One's funded appropriations have never approached the program's authorization ceiling. They peaked (in real dollar terms) during the last years of the Carter administration and are now beginning to approach those levels again. This failure of course is not unique to Chapter One but is consistent with the fate of virtually all urban program initiatives of the late 1960s. The Vietnam war, a relatively conservative democratic domestic policy agenda and the Reagan revolution severely limited the growth of even exceedingly popular programs (like Head Start) and killed others outright (like the public sector jobs component of CETA and General Revenue Sharing).

In this context, the continuation of Chapter One, and its relative stability can be as easily interpreted as a success than a failure. And it's true that urban interests, aligning with other education advocacy constituencies, succeeded in limiting proposed Chapter One funding cutbacks during the early years of the Reagan administration. Still, when judged in terms of its original objectives of providing supplementary federal funding support for all low-achieving students residing in economically depressed areas (an objective still implicitly recognized in authorized funding levels), Chapter One has fallen far short of the mark.

Since substantially increasing Chapter One funding levels has never been a realistic possibility, most of the attention over Chapter One funding has focused on how to best distribute this resource. Large urban school districts would clearly prefer a formula that concentrates resources on systems with high poverty concentrations. As noted earlier, throughout its history, virtually all districts in the country have received Chapter One aid, the amount being roughly proportional to the number of poor children residing in the community. However, many academics and policymakers maintain that the program would better serve its originally intended purpose, if some of the funds now going to communities with low poverty concentration were reallocated to ones

with high poverty rates. As one scholar has argued:

> Let me give two not extreme examples. In Madison, Wisconsin, a city that ... has an average elementary class size of under 23 students, there are Chapter 1 programs in schools which are in the 70th percentile of all schools in the nation. Contrast the need in these schools with that in the hundreds of inner city middle and secondary schools that average in the bottom quartile of achievement and that graduate under 60% of their students but do not have a Chapter 1 program because there are insufficient funds in these cities to serve middle and secondary schools (Smith 1987).

Research studies appear to confirm that the relationship between school poverty and student achievement is not linear across the school poverty spectrum but rather becomes particularly pervasive when school poverty concentrations are substantial. This finding would suggest that a funding formula that distributes assistance based on simple poverty counts, irrespective of school poverty concentration, would under-compensate (relative to need) areas, such as large urban districts, with high poverty concentrations. It would also help explain why there appear to be disproportionate rates of unserved low achievers in the highest poverty school districts.

Why hasn't the funding formula for Chapter One been substantially changed in light of this evidence? Why haven't urban constituencies demanded reform as they struggle to provide assistance to their needy populations with clearly inadequate resources while their more well-to-do brethren continue to receive program support?

The stability of the basic Chapter One funding formula represents an almost classic example of the power of distributive politics. Solid congressional backing for the program, through good times and bad, and from Republicans as well as Democrats, is at least partly attributable to a funding mechanism that conveys benefits universally. Program advocates, including urban interests, recognize that tampering seriously with the formula could jeopardize the long-standing support Chapter One has enjoyed. In this relatively austere social program environment, that hasn't been viewed as a risk worth taking. So advocates choose to work on the margins of the formula, such as recently helping to enact a provision (with the strong support of poor rural areas)

allocating 10 percent of appropriated funding increases to districts with the highest poverty concentrations.

While urban constituencies have tended to speak with one voice regarding program funding for Chapter One (all desiring greater funding levels in general and special considerations given to areas with unusually high poverty concentrations) the same can not be said of the program's rules and regulations. Here, public education interest groups have tended to advocate more regulatory flexibility while client-based organizations have desired more exacting and precise regulatory compliance standards for the program.

This tension is not difficult to imagine. It's natural to expect public education interests to want the discretion to use Chapter One funds in ways that make the most sense to them; free of externally imposed constraints and unnecessary and burdensome paperwork demands. It's also natural to expect client-based advocacy groups to be deeply concerned that without the protection coming from federal regulatory compliance standards, services to the program's intended populations would be sacrificed in favor of stronger constituencies within the school district. The result would be a dilution of needed programs and services to Chapter One's intended beneficiaries.

It was the documented and well publicized cases of such dilution (Martin and McClure 1969) that proved instrumental in strengthening the role and influence of client advocacy organizations in setting regulatory policy for Chapter One and, in turn, weakening the power of the more traditional system-based interest groups in this process. Throughout the 1970s client- based interests were almost uniformly successful in getting both Congress and the U.S. Office of Education to build a tight Federal regulatory framework around Chapter One (Kirst and Jung 1980). Prescriptive regulations were enacted or expanded in the areas of parent involvement, school and student selection, program evaluation, supplement no supplant and school resource

comparability to name but a few. Systems were also created in each state education agency for monitoring local compliance with these regulations (chiefly through approving local applications and conducting periodic site visits). In addition, compliance monitoring was also conducted through site visits to states and school districts by the U.S. Office of Education as well as federal compliance audits sponsored by the Department of Health Education and Welfare. By the middle 1970s it was clear that administrative procedures for this program were becoming institutionalized nationwide and that, in general, Chapter One program services were reaching their intended beneficiaries (NIE 1977, Goettel, Kaplan and Orland 1977, Peterson, Rabe and Wong 1986).

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 represented an important sea-change in the legislative history of Chapter 1. Reflecting the momentum of the Reagan revolution the new law for the first time reduced, rather than enhanced, statutory requirements and related oversight mechanisms under Chapter 1. School and district-wide parent advisory councils, for example, were no longer mandatory under the law. And the new law allowed states to permit their school districts to submit written assurances of compliance with legal requirements for school and student selection rather than documentary records attesting to such practice.

Significantly, urban constituencies were united again in 1981 in successfully resisting a more radical "block grant" deregulation of this program as well as more substantial funding cutbacks (*Congressional Quarterly* June 6, 1981). Nevertheless, even this more modest deregulation was viewed with alarm by those who were instrumental in the development of the Chapter One legal framework. They feared a drift to general aid as result of the legislated changes.

These fears proved, at least in the short-run, to be largely unfounded. Evaluations in the middle 1980s of the impact of the 1981 legislation revealed few changes in state and district administrative practice as a result of the new law.

Traditional state and local compliance behaviors were still being maintained, despite the frequent absence of explicit federal compliance standards (Birman et al., 1987, Farrar and Millsap 1987, Orland 1988). The behavior of large urban districts proved to be similar to other local systems in this regard, although some marginal differences were noted.[4]

1988 Reform: School-Wide Projects

The institutionalization of local practices under Chapter One was proving to be an increasing area of concern as Congress began to look at reauthorizing the program in 1988. While the program's maturity proved a bulwark against the use of funds for unintended beneficiaries or unintended purposes, it simultaneously discouraged creativity, innovation and introspection. From an educational improvement perspective, Chapter One was shown on average to have small but positive short- term effects on the populations it served. Shortcomings with traditional programmatic approaches were identified in (among other places) the congressionally mandated National Assessment of Chapter One (Birman et al., 1986), leading Congress in 1988 to enact new legislative provisions designed specifically to improve the program's educational effectiveness, Hawkins-Stafford Education Amendments.

Responding to criticisms that Chapter One services in heavily impacted areas would be more effective it its resources were targeted on improving the entire school instead of a subset of the lowest achievers within the school (see, for example, Smith 1987), Congress eased provisions for allowing such school-wide projects in schools where the incidence of poverty was 75 percent or greater (PL 100-297 section 1015). The new law, however, also requires that such projects develop an approved plan for how the funds will be used and that students in these programs demonstrate, after 3 years, at least comparable levels of achievement to other Chapter One participants. It is assumed that large urban districts would be especially likely to take advantage of this new provision since most have at least a few schools with poverty concentrations at or

above 75 percent. The school-wide project provisions were meant to address concerns regarding the isolation of Chapter One teachers and stigmatization of Chapter One students as well as to allow greater fiscal flexibility in expenditures of Chapter One monies. Previously monies could only be spent on the children in the school who qualified as exceptionally disadvantaged. The provision allowing monies to be spent on all the children in a school was intended to free administrators from having to demonstrate that the funds benefitted only eligible kids.

In this section of this paper we analyze the early experiences of four large urban school districts in implementing the new reform. The districts - Atlanta, Chicago, Dade County (Miami) and Dallas - reflect some of the diversity of the country's large urban school systems in geographical mix and local educational contexts. The sampling captures three of the 10 largest districts, a district with a highly innovative school-based management projects underway (Dade), and a district widely considered to be one of the most troubled in the country (Chicago). All four are representative of urban systems: high rates of students from low-income households, high rates of students for whom English is not a first language and high concentrations of minority children. See Table 1. In addition more focused interviews were conducted with four principals of school-wide project schools in Dade County to assess the impact of the program on children living in areas of concentrated poverty.

Data for this study were collected primarily from phone interviews with district staff involved in implementing Chapter One in the four districts. Interviewees included associate superintendents for instruction, Chapter One program directors and, when possible, research and evaluation staff and sub-district regional Chapter One program directors. For each district, the interviews, lasting 60-90 minutes, were conducted using structured protocols. Follow-up telephone calls were placed to elicit additional information and verify responses. The interviews were conducted during the winter of 1990-91.

At the time of the district interviews we found that only one district had pursued the school-wide option. The number of school-wide projects were negligible in three of the districts surveyed. Only Dade County had a substantial number of projects underway.

Table 2: School-Wide Projects, 1989-90

District	No. of School-wide Projects, 89-90
Atlanta	3
Chicago	6
Dade	48
Dallas	3

The Atlanta and Dallas districts, which had only three school-wide projects each, expressed considerable concern about the fiscal impact of serving all children in the school and the potential space crunch resulting from school-wide class size reductions. Dallas, for example, reported that it was not actively encouraging expansion of school-wide projects because the district could not afford more than a handful. Chicago had only six school-wide projects and indicated that the activities surrounding a large-scale system reform through local school councils had, for the moment, eclipsed all other reform efforts.

Dade County, alone, enthusiastically endorsed the concept and had 48 schools designated as school-wide projects. However, the appeal for Dade was that the school-wide approach reinforced the district's own restructuring orientation toward increased school-site management and deregulation. Dade County's self-initiated innovations identified the school as the unit of improvement and experimentation. Beside the 48 schools currently designated as school-wide projects, more were being planned for the upcoming years and expectations were high that the approach would produce student learning gains.

We then interviewed principals of four elementary schools which had been

designated school-wide project schools in Dade County. The schools were selected based on the recommendations of district Chapter One personnel who identified the schools as being in areas of concentrated poverty and as having competent and articulate principals who could speak effectively to the impact of the school-wide project at their school.

All four schools exhibited extremely high levels of poverty among their student body. Percentage of children participating in the free and reduced lunch program ranged from a low of 89% to a high of 96%. The two schools that tracked their annual mobility rate (the percent of students leaving the school within the course of a year) recorded rates of 52% and 62%, respectively. One school, in the Little Haiti section of Miami, estimated an employment rate of 50% among the parents of the school children.

Interviews substantiated that fiscal flexibility was permitting resource allocation decisions that were thought to be more supportive of effective schooling. The benefits identified by the principals can be grouped into three areas: integrated instructional approach, greater use of instructional technology and improved parent and community relationships.

As was intended by the drafters of the legislation, the fiscal flexibility was permitting a more unified, integrated and concentrated approach to improved schooling outcomes. All teachers were, in a sense, Chapter One teachers. They all benefitted from the additional resources available such as additional staff development and the support of para-professionals. All were involved in the more elaborate planning process required of school-wide projects and all were considered to be equally responsible for demonstrating the additional achievement gains required of school-wide projects. The objective of fostering a more unified teaching staff was being pursued.

More funds were being used for instructional support technology than had been the case before. Use of technology and other equipment purchased with Chapter One

funds had previously been restricted to only Chapter One-eligible students which caused logistical, auditing and morale problems. Thus, some administrators had foregone the use of Chapter One funds for these purchases. However, relieved of the need to monitor which students benefitted from the technology, the principals indicated increased use of technology.

Finally, three of the four principals mentioned the community relations benefits of the Chapter One school-wide projects approach. Three perspectives were underscored. One, parental involvement was enhanced because funds could be used to hire parent volunteers which was felt to be beneficial. Two, parents of Chapter One-eligible children were more willing to volunteer in the school when their child had not been isolated as a weak student. As one principal put it, "Parents don't want to participate in a dummy program for their kids." Three, all parents could now come in and use equipment, check out books and otherwise participate in all school activities. The climate was more conducive to a feeling of community.

While all four principals were enthusiastic about the school-wide project provisions and the flexibility it gave them in administering Chapter One programs, none believed it to be effecting any more than incremental changes and only one would point to clear achievement gains as a result. (Three of the schools were in their third year as a school-wide project school; one was in the second year.) The most frustrating element for the principals was the high mobility rate of the students rendering the concept of annual NCE gains problematic at best.

For the same reason the schools were eligible for the school-wide project option--high concentration of poverty--the principals believed that the obstacles the children faced (economic, cultural, and linguistic) were greater. Yet, as is often the case with a "waiver" approach to fiscal flexibility, along with the freedom from certain provisions came greater accountability for outcomes. As mentioned above, the school-wide projects provisions requires that students demonstrate after three years, at least

comparable levels of achievement to other Chapter One participants (who, presumably, do not live in similar areas of concentrated poverty).

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

An overall assessment of the impact of the 1988 school-wide project reform must conclude that the impact to date is modest. In three urban school districts, Chicago, Atlanta and Dallas, the option had not been vigorously pursued. The reform seems to be having the least impact in Chicago. The entire system is reeling from massive, state-legislated restructuring which is overwhelming district personnel and overshadowing other initiatives. In Dade, the reform appears to be being implemented enthusiastically but, even so, only incremental improvements in academic achievement is being predicted.

The federal reform seems pale compared to the extent and gravity of problems faced today by large, urban school districts. It became increasingly evident in conversations with district staff, that the economic and demographic forces impinging upon urban areas in the 1990s are shaking up the school systems in a profound manner. Increasing rates of child poverty, increasing concentration of poverty in inner-city communities and increasing family stresses including single-parent homes, both parents working outside the home, drug and alcohol dependency among family members, unsafe neighborhoods and downturns in critical health indicators such as infant mortality, immunization rates and health insurance coverage are intense pressure points on urban life in the 1990s and are causing comparable stress in the schools.

The Chapter One model emphasizes intensive concentration on key academic skills. It was established to administer to the needs of a growing number of poor students in the 1960s who were deemed to require special attention to keep pace academically with their non-disadvantaged peers. The 1988 school-wide project reform helps to strengthen the model but does not question it. However, urban areas and the

nature of poverty have changed dramatically since the 1960s. Now, for many urban districts, poor students with multiple problems are the norm. The concentration of poverty and weakened family and community supports are at much higher levels than in the 1960s.

Is the Chapter One program model sufficient to the job at hand? Chapter One may need to be rethought. The sole focus on academic achievement may be insufficient. The reality today is that for many urban schools the problems of poverty and low-academic achievement are intense and pervasive.

Recasting the Chapter One school as a full-service school would allow the resources and strategies within the Chapter One program to become one part of a comprehensive strategy addressing the needs of poor, inner-city children. A growing body of literature is documenting increased need among children and arguing the necessity of integrated and comprehensive policies to address them (see Kirst 1988, Schorr 1988, National Health/Education Consortium 1990). A case can be made that, for certain children, services such as after school care and health screening or integrated service strategies such as intergenerational education or inter-agency case management are not only as important as academic instruction but are prerequisite.

The school-wide project deregulatory strategy waived restrictions on client eligibility, but not on service eligibility. One policy option would be for the federal government to waive selectively restrictions on which services may be provided with Chapter One dollars for children in areas of high-poverty concentration. This would allow local school districts to leverage the Chapter One dollars more effectively, according to the mix of students and needs of the district. For example, monies could be used for local infrastructure development for collaboratives among social service, health, and education service providers or for integrated case management for children who have multiple problems and multiple service deliverers. Or, the monies could be used to coordinate services and programs among other federal education programs. As

was recently noted by a senior Education Department official in Washington, the many federal programs are increasingly serving the same child (Schrag, 1992).

Such a strategy would allow policy to advance beyond the current political impasse which impedes the allocation of Chapter One resources in a manner more responsive to need. This proposal would permit the Chapter One program to target differentially high-poverty concentration areas through discretionary waivers (not more funds) and thus run less risk of upsetting the political consensus achieved currently by having virtually all school districts receive some monies.

In sum, the Chapter One school-wide project reform enacted in the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Education Amendments may not be sufficient to address the critical educational and social problems of urban areas in the 1990s. The problems that beset inner-city schools are compounded by and stem from the larger economic, social and demographic forces at work in the communities. The supplemental resources that Chapter One funds offer a district may have a broader impact if used to strengthen the child and his or her community support systems in addition to strengthening the academic program. The singular focus of Chapter One on instructional strategies (and the only modest academic gains of the participating students) may be limiting the impact of the funds. A more complex set of interventions may be needed for urban children today and Chapter One dollars could play an important role in the planning and coordinating of a comprehensive and integrated school/community approach.

FOOTNOTES

[1] To qualify, a system need only demonstrate that it has 10 poor students residing within their district.

[2] Interestingly, despite the proportionately higher levels of student participation in Chapter One in urban districts, a typical school in an urban district is actually **less likely** than such a school in another type of district to receive Chapter One

support. In 1985-86, 60 percent of elementary schools in districts enrolling 25,000 pupils or more (the great majority of which are urban) were Chapter One recipients. This compares to an average elementary school participation rate of 89 percent for all districts. The same pattern holds at the middle/jr. high and high school levels (Williams et al., 1987). Several factors contribute to this phenomena including almost universal district eligibility for Chapter 1, regulatory provisions allowing districts with only one school (or one school per grade span) to automatically qualify for the program, and a desire among larger districts with severe compensatory education needs to purposely target greater levels of resources on their highest needs schools (and therefore fail to serve other schools that could technically qualify for the program) in order to maximize the likelihood of overall program impacts.

[3] Throughout this section we use the terms "urban interests" and "urban constituencies" to refer to national organizations and interest groups who consider improving education in urban areas to be a significant part of their program agenda. These include client based groups such as the NAACP, Children's Defense Fund and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, as well as more general purpose interest groups representing the established public education system such as teacher and administrator organizations like the National Education Association and Council of Great City Schools.

[4] The biggest differences between urban district behavior patterns and other systems under the new Chapter One law were in the areas of school resource comparability and parent involvement. Urban districts found the pre-1981 comparability standards particularly onerous because it forced them to allocate instructional staff in ways that conflicted with their own resource allocation policies and disrupted regular school and classroom activities (Ellman et al., 1981). The proportion of large districts (enrolling over 25,000 pupils) making resource reallocations under the new, more relaxed, comparability requirements declined from 16 percent (in 1981) to eight percent (in 1986) (Birman et al., 1987). Conversely, large districts were somewhat **more likely** than other systems to retain Chapter One parent advisory councils (Orland 1988). In these districts, the parent councils were more likely to have been institutionalized as support mechanisms for the program; channelling community demands in an efficacious manner (McLaughlin et al., 1985), and providing political support for disadvantaged programming within the educational bureaucracy.

REFERENCES

Bailey, S.K., E.K. Mosher. (1968). ESEA: *The Office of Education Administers a Law*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Birman, B.B., M.E. Orland, R.K. Jung, R.J. Anson & G.N. Garcia. (1987). *The Current Operation of the Chapter One Program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Child Trends, Inc., (1989). "State Data Profiles on Children," unpublished manuscript. Washington, DC: Author.

Farrar, E. and M.A. Milsap. (1986). *State and Local Administration of the Chapter One Program*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Goettel, R.J., B.A. Kaplan, and M.E. Orland. (1977). *Synthesis Report: A Comparative Analysis of ESEA, Title I Administration in Eight States*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Research Corporation.

James, Franklin. (1990). "City Needs and Distress in the United States: 1970 to the Mid-1980s" in *The Future of National Urban Policy*, edited by Marshall Kaplan and Franklin James. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kirst, Michael W. (1987). *The Condition of Children in California*. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Kirst, M.W. and R. Jung. (1982). "The Utility of a Longitudinal Approach in Assessing Implementation: A Thirteen-year View of Title I, ESEA". *In Studying Implementation, Methodological and Administrative Issues*, edited by W. Williams, R.F. Elmore, J.S. Hall, R. Jung, M. Kirst, S.A. McManus, B. Narver, R.P. Nathan, & R.K. Yin. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Martin, R. and P. McClure. (1969). *Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children*. Washington, DC: Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Inc.

National Center for Child Poverty. (1990). *Five Million Children: A Statistical Profile of Our Poorest Young Citizens*. New York, NY: Author.

National Health/Education Consortium. (1990). *Crossing the Boundaries Between Health and Education*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership and the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality.

National Institute of Education. (1977). *Administration of Compensatory Education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Orland, M.E. (1988). "The Black Box and Chapter One Policy: Patterns of Administrative Behavior and Their Antecedents". Presentation to the American Educational Reserach Association, April, 1988.

Peterson, P.E., B. Rabe, & K. Wong. (1986). *When Federalism Works*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Schorr, Lisabeth B. (1988). *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*.

New York: Anchor Press - Doubleday.

Schrag, J.A. (1992) as quoted in "E.D. Weighs Special-Education, Chapter One Rule Changes", *Education Week*, February 19.

Smith, M.S. (1987). "Selecting Students and Services for Chapter One". In *Policy Options for the Future of Compensatory Education: Conference Papers*. Edited by D.P. Doyle, J.S. Michie, & B.I. Williams. Washington, DC: Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc.

Wilson, William Julius. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

TABLE 1 : Selected Characteristics in Four Urban School Districts

	Rank Order by[1] Size of District Fall 1988	Enrollment[2] Fall 1990	Eligible for Free/[2] Reduced Price Lunch 1987-88	Limited English[2] Proficiency 1989-90	Percent[1] Minority 1988
Atlanta	43	60,711	69.5	1.4	NA
Chicago	3	404,991	71.2	10.3	87.6
Dade	4	278,788	62.0	14.1	78.9
Dallas	10	132,730	70.2	16.7	80.9

Sources: [1] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data Survey, 1990.
[2] Council of the Great City Schools, 1991.